

CORBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XXVII. No. 3.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, JAN. 21, 1815.

[Price 1s.

65]

[66]

AMERICA.

PEACE being now happily concluded with the *country of freedom*, it will not be necessary for me to occupy so large a portion of the Register, as I lately have, with observations relating to it. But, still this country, now nearly as much above all others in military and naval prowess as she is, and long has been, in civil, religious, and political liberty; still this favoured country, this asylum and example to the oppressed of all other nations, must continue to be a deeply interesting object with every one, whom I wish to see amongst my readers. I shall, therefore, in future, write of the affairs of America under one general title, numbering the several articles from No. I, onwards.—Previous to the war, I wrote several articles, under the form of *Letters* and otherwise; during the war a great many more. And, I am of opinion, if all these were collected together, from the month of July, 1810, to the 14th of this present month of January, 1815, they would be found to contain as good a history of this important struggle, as is likely to appear in any other shape. The rise, the progress, the termination, are all here to be found very amply detailed. The views on both sides; the passions, the prejudices; the means made use of to delude the people of England. The effect of the result of the contest on men's minds. All will here be found to have been faithfully recorded; that is to say, as far as I have *dared* to go; and for the restraint, which I have been under, and for which no human ingenuity could have compensated, the judicious and impartial reader will make a suitable allowance. This, however, is only said as to *our side of the water*; for, in the *country of freedom*, the *naked truth* will be told. *There* every man will write and publish what he pleases; *there* discussions will

be really free; *there* no man will tremble while he writes; and *there* truth must and will prevail.—It is often observed, that *history*, to be *impartial*, must be written *long after the date of the events of which it is a record*. This is a strange notion. It is so contrary to every rule of common life, that it naturally staggers one. If we want to keep our accounts, or the records of any proceedings in life, *accurately*, we never lose a moment in minuting the facts down as they occur. If evidence is given from a written paper, it must, to make the evidence good, have been *written at the moment that the facts occurred*. How strange, then is it, that, for *history* to be *true*, it must be written a century, or two, *after* the period, to which it relates; That is to say; that, to come at the *real truth* of any national occurrence, in order to arrive at a just decision upon the conduct of a nation, you must enter upon the inquiry *after all the witnesses are dead*, and after all the springs, hidden from common eyes, and which no man has dared to record an account of in print, are wholly forgotten and are sunk, for ever, out of sight. It is said, that, at the time when the events occur, the historian is too near to the *passions* and *prejudices* of the times, and is too likely to partake of them. But, at a hundred years after the events, what has he to refer to but *writings of the times*; and, how, then, is he more likely to get at the truth? We suppose the historian to seek *earnestly for truth*; and is he more likely to get at it, when all the springs are forgotten and all the witnesses dead, than when he has access to them all?—The real state of the case is this: the historian DARES NOT write a *true* history of present events, and a *true* description of the character of public institutions, establishments, laws, and men, in any country except America. *Truth*, in Eng-

land, may be a LIBEL; libels are punished more severely than the greatest part of felonies, as my Lord FOLKSTONE shewed, in the House of Commons, from an examination of the Newgate Calendar; and, it is well known, that in answering a charge of libel, the TRUTH of what you have written, or published, is not allowed EVEN TO BE GIVEN IN EVIDENCE. This is the real, and the only ground for pretending, that history ought to be written long after the period to which it relates. But, how are you bettered by length of time? It is a *libel* here to speak evil of the *dead*. The dead villain must not, if it give offence to certain persons, be truly characterized; and, remember, that the *sources*, to which the historian has to refer, are precisely those which have been created under this law of libel. In the great Republic of America, the case is wholly different. There, any man may publish *any thing that he pleases of public measures, or public men*, provided that he confine himself to *truth* in what he *asserts to be facts*. There any *opinions* may be published; but, here, even *opinions* expose writers, printers, and publishers to punishment; and, observe, that that which a man may say in a *private letter*, is held to be *published*, and if determined to be libellous, liable to punishment.—Well may we hold it to be a maxim, that the writing of history ought to be *delayed* until a remote period; but it would be a much more sensible maxim, that no history, written under such circumstances, (with a law that punishes libels on the *dead*) ought ever to be regarded as any thing better than a sort of *political romance*. There is no reason, however, why a history of this war should not *immediately* be written, and published in the Republic, with whom, thank the Ministers, and the President, and the brave Republicans, we are now at peace. From that country we may now receive such a history. It might be a little too *strong* to be *published* here; or even to be *sold* here. But those who wished for copies might get them through private channels; though, I ought to observe, for the good of the unwary, that to *lend* a book, or, to *shew* a book, to another person, is to publish a book in the eye of our sharp-sighted libel law. Nevertheless, if some able

and animated pen, set to work on this fine subject, a subject so closely connected with the cause of Freedom all over the world, there is no doubt of its obtaining circulation, even in England; and while it would be sure, by means of a French translation, to be read all over the Continent, where it must produce a prodigious effect. But I hope to see nothing of the *maudling* kind; nothing of the *milk and water*; nothing of the "*gentlemanly*" sort; no mincing of the matter. But, a real, *true*, history, applying to persons and acts the appellations which *justice* assigns them. If such a work were published, rather than not possess a copy, I would make one of my sons traverse the Atlantic, expressly to fetch it to me. I hope, however, that some man, in America, who feels upon the subject as I feel, will take the trouble to convey to me by a safe hand (not through the Post Office) a copy or two of the first work of the above description that shall appear. But mind, I should despise any history which should not speak of ALL the actors, on both sides, without the smallest regard to the humbug and palaver of the day, applying to their actions and their characters, and their motives, the *plainest* as well as the *truest* of epithets and terms. I want to have it all out. I am not much disposed to be unhappy. I never meet calamity half way. But really, such a work; the reading of such a work, and hearing my children read it, would make up for years of misery, if I had passed such; and it would be much more than a compensation for all the sufferings of my life. In short, I have set my heart on this thing, and, if I am disappointed, I shall be grieved more than I ever yet have been; ten thousand times more than I was, when I heard the sentence of JUDGE GROSE on me of two year's imprisonment in Newgate, a thousand pounds fine to the King, and seven years bound to good behaviour afterwards, in bonds of 5,000 pounds, for having written about the flogging of English local militiamen at Ely, and about German dragoons. But, why should I be disappointed? Have I not, if no one else will take up the pen, a *son* to take it up in the cause of truth and liberty? The world is wide; and now it is open.—

In the mean while let us not neglect that which is yet within our own power. We ought to keep the Republic constantly before our eyes. Though we make her less the subject of observation than we have done for some time past, we ought never to *lose sight* of her. The enemies of liberty are always on the watch to assail, through her sides, the object of their mortal hatred; and, therefore, we ought to lose no occasion of facing and of fighting them. In order to facilitate reference, and to give something of uniformity of arrangement to the matter in the Register, relating to America, I intend to insert, under one general head, all such matter of my own writing, and to mention under that general head the several topics treated of, in the following manner.

No. I.

AMERICA.—Mr. HUNT's *motion* and Sir John Cox HIPPISLEY's *speech respecting her*.—The Courier's attack on Mr. BINNS, a publisher at Philadelphia.

At a Meeting of the county of Somerset, on the 9th instant, a curious occurrence took place with regard to the peace with America. I will first give the account of it from the *Times newspaper* of the 16th instant, and make on it such observations as most naturally present themselves. The reader should first be informed, however, that the meeting was held for the purpose of discussing a petition to Parliament against the *Property Tax*, or *Tax upon Income*, which tax ought, by law, to expire in a few months, but which tax it is supposed the government means to propose the *continuation*, or *revival*.—The following is the report of the *Times*:—“ On Monday last, at the meeting of the freeholders, &c. holden at Wells, to petition Parliament for the repeal of the *Property-tax*, after the business of the day was disposed of (an account of which has already appeared in this paper).—Mr. HUNT remarked, that the meeting should not disperse without expressing its thankfulness to those by whose efforts peace had been made between us and America. He therefore read a resolution, which he submitted for their approbation: “That the thanks of this meeting are due to those by whose exertions peace with the Americans, the *only free remaining people in the world*, has been re-

“ stored to this country.” Sir J. C. HIPPISLEY could see no reason whatever for calling the Americans *the only free people in the world*, and should certainly divide the meeting if the motion were persisted in. It was a *LIBEL on our own country*; for his part, he HATED THE AMERICANS. They were *a set of slaves* to the Government of France, and—(*some expressions of disapprobation arose*) when Mr. DICKINSON said, that he certainly must join in deprecating the resolution. He hoped the meeting would not consent to compliment any nation at the expense of our own, and of every other in the globe. He had considerable reason for believing, that the Congress at Vienna was now employed in endeavouring to *unrivel the chains of the suffering Africans*; and engaged, as the Powers of Europe were, in so sacred a cause, he could not consent that any aspersion, direct or indirect, should be cast upon them. Mr. HUNT then requested the Sheriff to put the resolution, which, upon the shew of hands, was negatived by a very considerable majority.” Whether there be any *free country in the world*, still remaining, besides the Republic of America, is a question that I do not choose to decide, or to give my opinion upon. But, I cannot help observing, that the question was decided in the negative by a meeting of the county of Somerset only by “a considerable majority;” and, I must further observe, that the report of this “considerable majority” comes to us through the *Times newspaper*, that channel of skunk-like abuse of America and all that is American. Let it be remembered, too, that the power of deciding who had the majority lay wholly and absolutely with the Sheriff, who is an officer appointed by the crown. This being the case, the words, “considerable majority” will be pretty well understood to mean *any thing but a large majority*; and, perhaps, some people may doubt whether there was any majority at all. At any rate, the County of Somerset divided upon the question of, whether America was, or was not, *the only free country left in the world*. This was, at least, a question for which *many* were in the affirmative. It was received and put to the vote without any marks of disapprobation; while, on the other hand, he

was hissed, who said that he *hated* the Americans, and who called them *the slaves of the French Government*. And why, good Sir John, do you *hate* the Americans? What have they done to you? You say, that they are the slaves of the Government of France; but you do not find it convenient to produce any proof of what you say. This, Sir John, is one of the old state falsehoods of the *Times* newspaper, which you are retailing at second-hand like a Grub-street pedlar. You are, in this instance, a poor crawling imitator of a wretched grinder of paid-for paragraphs. *Prove*, or attempt to prove what you say. Attempt, at least, to prove, that the Americans are the slaves, or have been, the slaves of the French; or, you must be content to go about saddled with the charge of having made an assertion, without being either able or willing to shew it to be true. I assert, that the Americans were not, in any shape or degree, subservient to France. I assert, that they all along acted the part of a nation *truly independent*. I assert, that they, in no case, shewed a partiality for the Government of Napoleon. If any proof were wanted of their having placed *no reliance upon France*, we have it in the fact, the fact so honourable, so glorious to them, and so unfortunate for us; I mean the fact of their *continuing the contest after Napoleon was put down*, and still, as firmly as before, *refusing to give up to us one single point*, though they saw us allied with all Europe, and though they saw the whole of our monstrous force directed against them, having no other enemy to contend with. This *proves* that they placed no reliance upon France. When they declared war, they saw us with a powerful enemy in Europe. Upon that circumstance they, of course, calculated, as they had a right to do; but, when that enemy, contrary to their expectation, was put down all of a sudden, and the whole of our enormous force was bent against America, she was not intimidated. She still set us at defiance; she faced us; she fought us; and, at the end of a few months, instead of receiving a *Vice Roi* at Washington, as we had been told she would, she brought us to make peace with her without her giving up to us one single point of any sort. Deny this, if you can, Sir John; and, if you cannot, answer to the people of Somerset for the speech, which the *Times* has pub-

lished as yours. But, Sir John, why do you **HATE** the Americans? You cannot, surely, hate them because they pay their President only about six thousand pounds a year, not half so much as our **APOTHECARY GENERAL** receives. You, surely, cannot hate them because they do not pay in the gross amount of their taxes as much as we pay for the mere collection and management of ours. You, surely, cannot hate them because they keep no sinecure placemen, and no pensioners, except to such as have actually rendered them services, and to them grant pensions only by vote of their real representatives. You, surely, cannot hate them because, in their country, the press is *really free*, and *truth* cannot be a *libel*. You, surely, cannot hate them because they have shewn that a *cheap* government is, in fact, the strongest of all governments, standing in no need of the troops or of treason laws to defend it in times even of actual invasion. You may, indeed, *pity* them because they are destitute of the honour of being governed by some illustrious family; because they are destitute of Dukes, Royal and others, of Most Noble Marquises, of Earls, Viscounts and Barons; because they are destitute of Knights of the Garter, Thistle and Bath, Grand-Crosses, Commanders and Companions; because they are, in spite of the efforts of the Massachusetts' intriguers, still destitute of Illustrous Highnesses, Right Honourables, Honourables, and Esquires; because they are destitute of long robes and big wigs, and see their lawyers, of all ranks, in plain coats of grey, brown, or blue, as chance may determine; because they are destitute of a Church established by law and of tithes: you, may, indeed, *pity* the Republicans on these accounts; but, Sir John, it would be cruel to *hate* them. To hate is not the act of a Christian, and very illly becomes a man like yourself, who has been a hero, a perfect dragon, in combating the anti-christian principles of the French Revolution. Pity, the Americans, Sir John. Forgive them, Sir John. Pray for them, Sir John. But do not hate them, thou life and fortune defender of our holy religion. Pray that they may speedily have a King and Royal Family, with a Commander in Chief and Field Marshals; that they may have a Civil List and Sinecures; that they may



have Lords, Dukes, Grand-Crosses, Clergy, Regular Army, and tythes; *pray* for these things, in their behalf, as long as you please; *pray* that the Americans may have as good a government as we have; but, because they have it not, do not *hate* them. I was really very happy to perceive, that you were *hissed* for this sentiment, at the County Meeting. I was happy to perceive it, because it was a sign, that the people of England are coming to their senses upon this the most important of all subjects. Why could you not have expressed yourself in terms, less hostile to every generous and humane feeling? I confess, that Mr. HUNT's motion, though if he thought it *true*, he was right in making it, might fairly be objected to by any one who thought differently. But, you might have reprobated the endeavour to describe England as *not free*, (if you regarded her as being free) without saying that you *hated* the Americans. This it was, that shocked the meeting, and, accordingly it hooted you, as appears from the report, as published even by the *Times* newspaper. Every effort ought now to be made to produce reconciliation with America; and, you appear to have done all that you were *able* to do, to perpetuate the animosities engendered by the war. Mr. DICKINSON managed his opposition to the motion more adroitly. He observed, that the holy-war Powers, now in Congress at Vienna, were, "he had *considerable* reason to believe," engaged in an effort to univet the chains of the *African* slave, and, therefore, he could not consent to any motion that might seem to glance against *their* people being free. So, Mr. DICKINSON concluded, it seems, that, if the "sacred-cause" powers should settle upon some general prohibition against the increase of slaves *in the West Indies*, there cannot possibly remain any thing like slavery in Russia, Prussia, Poland, Germany, Bohemia, Transylvania, Sclavonia, Italy, Spain, or Portugal. I should like to have heard the chain of argument, through which this member for Somerset arrived at such a conclusion from such premises. I suppose that it must have been something in this way: That the "sacred-cause" powers are all perfectly sincere in their professions; that, being so, it is impossible to believe, that they would shew so much anxiety for the freeing of the Africans, while they held their own subjects

in slavery; and, that, *therefore*, it is impossible to believe, that the people of Russia, and Germany, and Hungary, are not all perfectly free. I dare say, that Mr. Dickinson said a great deal more upon the subject, and produced *facts* as well as arguments to prove, that Mr. HUNT's motion was an unjust attack upon those powers; and, I confess, that it would be a great treat to me to see those *facts* upon paper.

MR. BINNS, *a publisher in Philadelphia*.—In the COURIER of a few days back, there appeared an article from an American paper, pointing out some of the means, which the government of that country ought to employ to annoy and injure England; and, the Courier, at the head of the article, observes, that it is taken from a paper, published by one BINNS, who was engaged in "the "TREASONABLE plot of O'Connor." The article contained a very urgent recommendation to the Congress to pass efficient laws for providing comfortable means of subsistence for *English deserters*; and also to pass laws for the *destruction of English commerce by American privateers*. Now, it does, and it must give one pain to see an Englishman exerting, with so much zeal, his talents and the powerful means of the press against his native country, that country being ours as well as his, and containing, as we know it does, so many excellent individuals, such a mass of industry, integrity, and virtue of every sort. But, let us be just: let us look at the other side; let us consider the cause of this hostility in Mr. BINNS; and every candid man, though he may still, and will still be *sorry* to see, that England has such powerful enemies (for a press *really free* is all power) in her own children, will be less disposed, I do not say to *blame*, but certainly less disposed to *abuse* Mr. Binns. This malignant writer calls him a TRAITOR. This is false. He was, indeed, *tried* on a charge of High Treason; but, though the greatest talents were employed against him, he was found to be "NOT GUILTY," and was, accordingly, DISCHARGED by the Judge. He was taken up in virtue of a warrant from the *Secretary of State*, the *Habeas Corpus Act* being then suspended; he was imprisoned in the Tower; he was conveyed to Maidstone to be tried; he was there declared to be NOT GUILTY,

and was discharged; and then he quitted the country, went to America, there became a citizen of that country, carrying with him the recollection of what he had actually undergone, and of the risks that he had run in his native land. Besides, we must not overlook the state of the country at that time, and the dangers, to which every man, called a JACOBIN was exposed. A strong and most curious fact, relating to this point, came out on Mr. BINNS's trial. Mr. PLOMER, who is now the Vice Chancellor, was a Counsel for the prisoners, and a most able Counsel he was. Just as the Jury were about to be impanelled, he applied to the Court to have read the following AFFIDAVIT and LETTER, which Letter, as the reader will see, was written by a Clergyman of the Church of England, named ARTHUR YOUNG, to a Mr. GAMALIEL LLOYD, his acquaintance and friend. I shall insert the two documents, just as they stand in the State Trials, published in 1798, by Mr. GURNEY.

“ *KENT TO WIT.—The King against James O'Corigly otherwise called James Quigley otherwise called James John Fivey, Arthur O'Connor, Esq. John Binns, John Allen, and Jeremiah Leary, on a charge of high treason.* ”

“ Gamaliel Lloyd, of Bury St. Edmunds, in the county of Suffolk, Esq. maketh oath and saith, that he this deponent did, on or about the 3rd day of May instant, receive the letter hereunto annexed from Arthur Young of Bradfield, in the county of Suffolk, Clerk, and that he hath frequently received letters and corresponded with the said Arthur Young, and that he verily believes that the said letter is written by, and in the proper hand writing of, the said Arthur Young: And this deponent further saith, that he saw and conversed with the said Arthur Young on the 13th day of May instant; after this Deponent had been served with a writ of subpoena requiring his attendance at Maidstone, in the county of Kent, on the 21st day of May instant, with the said annexed letters, upon which occasion this deponent informed the said Arthur Young that he was so subpoenaed for the purpose aforesaid, and urged the said Arthur Young to come to Maidstone aforesaid, and meet the charge, and extenuate his fault in the best way he

“ was able, concerning which he hesitated, but he seemed disposed to come, if there was a place in the coach for him. And this deponent further saith, that the mother of the said Arthur Young being present on the said last mentioned occasion, also urged the said Arthur Young to inform her of the names of the Jurors mentioned in the said letter to whom he had spoken, as stated in the said letter, but he refused to comply with her said request, whereupon this deponent advised the said Arthur Young to consult Mr. Forbes, an attorney, and a relation of his as to what would be best for him to do, and to act accordingly, to which he the said Arthur Young seemed to this deponent to assent.

“ *Sworn in Court at Maidstone, the County of Kent, May 21, 1798, before F. BULLER.* ”

“ *GAMALIEL LLOYD.* ”

“ DEAR SIR,—I dined yesterday with three of the Jurymen of the Blackburn Hundred, who have been summoned to Maidstone to the trial of O'Connor and Co.; and it is not a little singular, that not one yeoman of this district should have been summoned to an Assize for this county, nor to any of the Quarter Sessions (excepting the Midsummer) for more than fifty years. These three men are wealthy yeomen, and partisans of the *High Court Party.* Now this is as it ought to be, and as they are good farmers and much in my interest, to be sure I exerted all my eloquence to convince them how absolutely necessary it is, at the present moment, for the security of the realm, **THAT THE FELONS SHOULD SWING.** I represented to them, that the acquittal of Hardy and Co. laid the foundation of the present conspiracy, the Manchester, London Corresponding, &c. &c. I urged them, by all possible means in my power, **TO HANG THEM THROUGH MERCY,** a momento to others; that had the others have suffered, the deep laid conspiracy which is coming to light would have been necessarily crushed in its infancy. These, with many other arguments, I pressed, with a view that they should go into Court avowedly determined in their verdict, **NO MATTER WHAT THE EVIDENCE.** An impo-

“ ce
“ a b
“ O'C
“ An
“ FIC
“ AC
“ NE
“ tha
“ “ P
“ she
“ up
“ the
“ ma
“ ga
“ and
“ ser
“ EV
“ TI
“ Sis
“ lan
“ cli
“ de
“ ter
“ cr
“ po
“ th
“ Al
“ ne
“ Su
“ fo
“ nu
“ es
“ Ir
“ fe
“ ne
“ in
“ ta
“ w
“ se
“ an
“ re
“ p
“ u
“ w
“ it
“ th
“ P
“ n
“ P
“ i
“ t
“ C
“ j
“ f
“ “

“ cent man committed to gaol never offers
“ a bribe to a turnkey to let him escape,
“ O’Connor did this to my knowledge.
“ And although THE JUDGE IS SUF-
“ FICIENTLY STERN, AND SELDOM
“ ACQUITS WHEN HANGING IS
“ NECESSARY, the only fear I have is,
“ that when the Jury is impanelled, the
“ ‘Blues’ may gain the ascendancy. In
“ short, I pressed the matter so much
“ upon their senses, that if any one of
“ the three is chosen, I think *something*
“ *may be done*. These three men have
“ gained their good fortunes by farming,
“ and I think they are NOW thoroughly
“ sensible THAT THEY WOULD LOSE
“ EVERY SHILLING BY ACQUIT-
“ TING THESE FELONS. I have seen,
“ Sir, that detested shore, that atrocious
“ land of despotism, from Shakspeare’s
“ cliffs, Calais steeples, and truly I shud-
“ dered not at the precipice, but by con-
“ templating the vicinity to me of a mis-
“ creant crew of hellions vomiting their im-
“ potent vengeance, and already satiating
“ their bloody appetites upon my country.
“ Ah, my good Sir, we are safe; it is
“ next to a moral impossibility that in
“ Sussex or Kent they could land in
“ force; the batteries, forts, &c. are so
“ numerous, that hardly a gun-boat could
“ escape being blown to atoms. But
“ Ireland, alas! alas! it is lost, Sir, I
“ fear it is gone. Here Government are
“ now expending hundreds of thousands
“ in fortifying what can never be at-
“ tacked; they are fortifying the Castle
“ with out-works, ravelings, counter-
“ scarps, and immense ditches, and they
“ are absolutely furrowing under the
“ rocks for barracks; it is, indeed, a most
“ prodigious undertaking, but absolutely
“ useless. It is a pity, indeed it is,
“ when money is so much wanted, to see
“ it so wantonly wasted, and all done in
“ throwing down the cliff upon the beach.
“ Remember me to Mrs. L. and your fa-
“ mily, assure her we all expect a re-
“ publican visitation here. This county
“ is split into party; but I never enter
“ the habitation of a yeoman but *I see*
“ *the sword of its owner suspended*;
“ GLORIOUS SIGHT! But the militia, O
“ Lord! at Horsham, Shoreham, Ash-
“ ford, Battle, Lewes, Brighton, Ring-
“ mer, &c. &c. I very seldom meet
“ with a sober man, ‘tis nothing but a
“ dreary sight of drunkenness. Fine sol-
“ diers in action! their pay, their pay so

“ extravagant. I have now as fine a sight
“ of the chalk-hill opposite as ever was
“ seen. The sun is setting upon that
“ vile land, and presents an object not a
“ little disagreeable.

“ Your’s truly,

“ *Dover, May-day.* “ A. YOUNG.”
Addressed “ GAMALIEL LLOYD, Esq.
Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk.”

Now, the reader will bear in mind, that Mr. BINNS would probably have had these three men amongst his jurors, if Mr. LLOYD had not made the letter of the Reverend Gentleman known. This letter is an instance of the length, to which men went at the time when Mr. BINNS was prosecuted; and when he left England. Can any just man say, then, that he blames Mr. BINNS for seeking an asylum in America? And, if he cannot blame him for seeking that asylum, can he blame him for acting the part of a patriotic citizen towards his adopted country; or, rather, towards the country which has adopted him? How great so ever may be our sorrow at seeing the arms, and the more powerful pens, of Englishmen wielded with such effect too, against England, our accusations against them ought, at any rate, to be confined within the bounds of truth. And, does this foolish and base writer in the Courier imagine, that he will, by abusing Mr. BINNS, and falsely accusing him, diminish the powers of his pen? Mr. BINNS, safe on the other side of the Atlantic, may, probably, *laugh* at his calumniator’s malice; but, if it has any effect at all on him, that effect must be to make him more zealous in his hostility against England. It is a fact, of which I have no doubt at all, that, if ever our country experiences any serious calamity from the power of America, she will owe no small portion of it to the revenge of men, who have emigrated from her. The native Americans are brave, ingenious, enterprising beyond any other people in the world; but, still the accession of hundreds of men of talent, burning with revenge and communicating that passion to their children, must have dreadful weight in the scale of hostility. Is it not, therefore, a species of madness in a man, who affects to write on the side of the English government, to report to all the means in his power to keep that revenge alive? In America the paths of political power are open to all its citizens, adopted as well as

native ; and, is it to be expected, that we shall not feel the effect of this abuse, whenever that power glides into the hands of those who are thus abused ? America is now upon the pinnacle of fame. Her power must grow 'till it be great. England must and will feel the effect of that power ; but, it is very unwise to endeavour to enlist against her the perpetuation of that revenge, which might otherwise die away with time.

“ MURDER! MURDER!”

“ This is the good old cry against cruelty and oppression: never had any more occasion to raise it than I have. “ A most ungrateful clamour is raised against my existence, though in the course of nature my dissolution cannot be far distant. The English nation is indebted to me, much, for carrying Lord Wellington and his brave troops through a course of brilliant victories. “ The naval superiority of England has been sustained by my aid; the American navy has hid its head under the waters of its own harbours at the approach of my power: and yet meetings are now holding in many parts of England at which I am stigmatized as cruel, oppressive; as most tyrannical and iniquitous. Now, considering the very important services I have rendered the country, this, I again say, is most ungrateful. In speaking of me, nothing extenuate nor set down aught in malice. Let the blessings I have conferred, as well as the trouble I have occasioned, be remembered. Without me, Buonaparte might, this day, perhaps, have been master of England and Sovereign of the World. It is most unhandsome as well as ungrateful to kick and cuff, to insult and traduce me, the moment it is supposed my aid can be dispensed with.

“ I am, &c.

“ THE PROPERTY TAX.”

The above is taken from the COURIER of the 18th instant; and, it must be confessed, the complaint of poor Property Tax is not altogether unfounded, though it pretends too far, when it talks of making the “ American Navy hide its head,” and of keeping Napoleon out of England, which the people could have done without a Property Tax full as well, at least, as with it. It is, however, very amusing to hear this tax so outrageously abused

as it now is by many of those, who called others Jacobins because they spoke of it in terms not a hundredth part so opprobrious. The Tax may be, and is, now unnecessary; but, has it changed in principle or in the mode of its collection ? Is it not what it always was ? Is it not what it was when Sir FRANCIS BURDETT described it in the address, which he moved in the House of Commons in 1812 ? Has it become more cruel, more oppressive, more inquisitorial, more partial, more tyrannical than it was then ? Has it changed its nature, or the mode of collection changed its effect, since Mr. CARTER was sent to jail and fined for libelling it and the measures of taking it from him ? Whence, then, this new discovery ? Whence this light, all at once broken in upon the nation ? If it be true, that the tax is, in its very nature, tyrannical, as it is now called, it follows, of course, that this nation has been submitting to tyranny for the last twenty years. There is no denying this conclusion, if the premises be true; and therefore, I wonder how men can look each other in the face, while they are passing such resolutions.—The truth is, that the fall of Napoleon is the hardest blow that our Taxing system ever felt. It is now impossible to make people believe, that immense fleets and armies are necessary. And, at the same time, prices having been reduced nearly one half by opening this island to the exports of a country where the taxes are comparatively trifling, the receipt at the Exchequer must diminish without even any diminution of the number of taxes. The peace is, as I said it would be, a sort of Revolution in England. The people are sore. They were drunk last June and July. The drunken fit is over, and they are now in a state of lassitude and pain; aching heads and empty purses.—The whole of the achievements of the Property Tax have not, however, been named by the Courier, who has overlooked grants of public money, sinecures, the restoration of the Pope and the Inquisition, and many others.

LORD COCHRANE AND THE LEGION OF HONOUR.

The following article appeared in the Morning Chronicle of Wednesday last :— “ Yesterday a Chapter of the Order of the Bath was held, at two o’clock, at

“the Prince’s Chamber, Westminster, at which were present—His Royal Highness the Duke of York, as Grand Master; “the Rev. Dr. Vincent, Dean of Westminster, Dean of the Order; the Right Hon. Sir David Dundas, Sir George II. Barlow, and Sir Richard Strachan; the Genealogist, Sir George Nayler; the Deputy Bath King of Arms, Francis Townsend, Esq. and the Gentleman Usher of the Scarlet Rod, G. F. Beltz, Esq. all in their robes.—The object of the Meeting being merely to communicate to the Chapter the measures which had been adopted for the DEGRADATION of Lord Cochrane, and the expulsion of his banner and achievements from King Henry the Seventh’s Chapel, the Chapter adjourned soon after three o’clock.”—So then;—the new legion of Honour have held their first meeting, or “Chapter,” as they call it; and, in a manner perfectly consistent with their “most honourable” intentions, they have commenced their proceedings with communicating on the important subject of having expelled LORD COCHRANE from their “honourable Order,” and turned out his banner and “Achievements” from King Henry the VIIth’s Chapel.—“Lord Cochrane’s Achievements!!!”—I have carefully looked over the list of names of this honourable fraternity, beginning with his Royal Highness, our beloved Frederick, the Duke of York, and I can discover very sufficient reasons why they should be most anxious to get rid of any record of LORD COCHRANE’s “Achievements.” Certainly there is very little relationship between them and the achievements of the members of this “most honorable fraternity.” Can any of these men be so silly as to suppose that they have “degraded,” as they term it, LORD COCHRANE by this measure? Can they suppose that they have inflicted upon him one moment’s pain? Poor men! They sadly deceive themselves: LORD COCHRANE suffers no regret at quitting the association just remodelled. The quill drivers at the Horse-Guards; the Postmaster of the Duke of Wellington; our beloved Frederick’s Private Secretary, and such like gallant men, are certainly little fitted for the society of LORD COCHRANE. The “achievements” of these men must be, indeed, of a most curious description. I cannot forget “Sir James Wil-

“loughby Gordon, Knight of the Bath,” in his ever to be remembered examination on Mrs. Clarke’s affair with the beloved Frederick. I suppose this is one of his “achievements.” LORD COCHRANE’s are, indeed of a very different Order. The expression which the representatives of our most revered Regent, the Right Honourable Henry Canning, thought proper to apply to the American navy, when he described it as hearing a few “bits of striped bunting,” cannot but bring to every man’s recollection the extraordinary “achievements” which vessels, bearing this “striped bunting,” have performed over our, hitherto reckoned, *invincible* navy. One of these bits of *red ribbon*, which decorate the knights commanders of the new order, is, I understand, on the way to Lisbon, as a reward for this statesman’s elegant, and witty, and novel designation of the American navy. The list of his “achievements” must then be put up in Westminster Abbey; and no doubt they will occupy, with peculiar grace and effect, the niche vacated by the “expulsion and degradation of Lord Cochrane,” which the “Chapter” of the “honorable Order” has just assembled, in full form, to ratify. I confess I should like to see this list of our Ambassador’s “Achievements.” It appears that a grievous complaint has been made by some of the persons calling themselves “Heralds at Arms,” as to a sort of *intruder*, who has been put amongst them, by the Prince Regent, and whose peculiar duty, is said to be to *manufacture*, in good set terms, “the Achievements” of these “honorable gentlemen.”—Now, I think, the whole College of Arms, Heralds and all, even including these new intruders, will be rather puzzled to compose the poetical effusion which is to decorate Mr. Canning’s banner. Fiction is the soul of poetry. This then will be a poem of first rate merit. I shall endeavour to obtain a copy of it, and I shall certainly gratify my readers by giving it to them as soon as it can be procured.

THE CONGRESS.

Mr. COBBETT.—I have hitherto observed no particular notice in your Journal of the proceedings of the assemblage of royal and noble negociations that compose the congress of Vienna. It is said

by that race of expectants who are always apologizing for kingly errors, that there is now a period arrived, when the ambition of monarchs is not tarnished with injustice; when the sceptre is not supported by blood, but by the free and generous applause of the people; when the Liberators of France will give peace to the world, and establish the general tranquillity upon a basis too firm to be shaken. However ridiculous might appear the assimilation of absolute monarchy and impartiality, of policy and justice, we were still disposed to give them credit for generally meaning well; and we augured from their intentions what we might have doubted from their capacities. The *Courier*, and its satellites, now say that we were deceived; that the deliberations of Vienna have unveiled their motives, and that personal advantage seems the general and the only point on which they proceed to argue. Whether our newspaper press be correct or not in ascribing these motives to the Allied Sovereigns, it is not my province to decide. To time, which tries all things, it must be left to settle this. I cannot, however, refrain from remarking, that the infamous partitioning of Poland in the first instance, gave to the revolutionary leaders of France an example and a fair justification for proceeding in a similar manner; and I should not be surprised if the seeds of another, and a more tremendous revolution, were now sowing upon the continent, by the legitimate monarchs of the day, again forming treaties of convenience, and schemes of personal aggrandisement and private advantage. Napoleon really possessed an equal right to Spain, with Russia to Poland, or Prussia to Saxony. If these projected annexations shall take place, let us hear no more of the tyranny, or the injustice of the Emperor of France. It has been very well remarked, that Calvin was far more cruel than the Catholics whom he so abused; because, alive to the condemnation of their cruelty, he equalled its vilest enormity. Why then, if what is said of these sovereigns be true, are they less guilty than the victim of their efforts? Why is the conduct which in Buonaparte was so universally execrated to be tolerated, or approved, in them? This cannot be justice; this surely is not generosity. But why must Prussia have

Saxony? Does Saxony wish for the union? No. Directly the reverse. Do these liberators of the world, fulfil their promise respecting national rights by outraging them? Could Buonaparte have done more than force upon a country a sovereignty which it hated? Have not these liberators, according to the *Times* and *Courier*, done still more? Have they not deprived Saxony of a monarch which it loves? Whom has the King of Saxony offended? his people? *they* forgive him. The nations of Europe? What, by entering into treaties with Buonaparte? They have all done the same. By adhering to the faith of those treaties? Yes. Here lies the real grievance: his adherence to *his word, his treaty*, reproached many of them with the breach of theirs: he had received benefits from the hands of Napoleon, and did not think it consistent or honest to betray him. The *example* he had before his eyes, did not convince. He exhibited the phenomenon of a sovereign who did not think *convenience* a sufficient reason for falsehood. The *Times*, I observe, talks of *conquest*, as giving the negotiating monarchs the right of disposing of the fate of Saxony, and of transferring the Saxons, like cattle, to a master they dislike. Would it have been advisable to talk of the conquest of their country to those Saxon soldiers who joined the ranks of the allies at the battle of Leipzig? Would Bernadotte, who placed himself at their head, and called upon them to follow him in the cause of the liberties of Europe; would he have thought it the best method of securing their aid, by telling them that their country would be treated as a conquered province? But Prussia must have indemnity? Indemnity for what? For the loss of Hanover, which she received from Buonaparte to wink at the ruin of Austria? For the loss of her own provinces in the war with Buonaparte which she herself provoked? Are these the claims of Prussia to the annexation of Saxony? Can her best friends assign any other? Would the worst of her enemies desire any more? Have the *Times* and *Courier* no recollection of their own *consolation* at the ruin of the *infidel* House of Brandenburgh? Have they so soon forgot their *pious* remarks upon the *judgment* which attended the

kingd
the
narch
notic
It w
mona
ment
cumf
I sha
rema
Polan
—
S1
pear
of th
head
It is
light
abou
patin
Bible
lic v
sesse
to r
to o
featu
publ
idle
to t
sions
of
Emp
as t
state
to t
store
matt
hood
the
nati
reli
lant
gage
the
of t
man
form
poin
este
part
year
exist
for
pun
men
yet
by

kingdom of the *Deist* Frederick. Has the *Christianity* of the present monarch retrieved its destiny? I shall not notice the pretext of *arrondissement*: It would be only the plea of universal monarchy in its extreme; no arrondissement could be complete, but the circumference of the globe. In my next I shall offer with your permission, a few remarks on the pretension of Russia to Poland.

JUVENIS.

THE PILLORY.

SIR.—The remarks which lately appeared in your journal on the subject of the pillory, do equal credit to the head and to the heart of *Benevolus*. It is rather extraordinary in these *enlightened* times, when we hear so much about converting the heathen, emancipating the slaves, and encouraging the Bible Societies, that scarcely one public writer should be found, who possessed the courage, or the inclination, to reprobate a practice so disgraceful to our law, and marked with so many features of a barbarous policy. The public press every where teems with idle and contradictory speculations as to the probable result of the discussions at Vienna; whether the system of aggrandisement attributed to the Emperor Napoleon, is to be adopted as the law of nations, or whether that state of things which existed previous to the French Revolution, is to be restored. These and some contemptible matters as to a new order of knighthood, are the only topics for which the people of this *highly cultivated* nation seem at present to have any relish, or on which the pen of the philanthropist or of the philosopher is engaged. The amelioration of our laws, the state of our prisons, the remains of that rudeness which still pervades many of our customs, and presents a formidable barrier to civilization, are points that few writers appear interested in, nor which have found many partizans among the people. Some years ago, I heard something of the existence of a society in the metropolis for the diffusion of knowledge on the punishment of death, and the improvement of prison discipline; but I have yet to learn that any thing was effected by this institution, or if the objects for

which it was formed have been abandoned. No notice, as far as I have been able to discover, has been taken of it in any of our newspapers, or other periodical publications. A society with such liberal and enlarged views, could not fail, in my opinion, to meet with generous support were its intentions made sufficiently public, and why these should be kept in reserve, if the association now exists, is a problem that seems very difficult to solve. It would gratify many of your readers, if any of your correspondents could give some information respecting this society, which might, with great propriety, and without any departure from its original views, connect the subject of the pillory with the other important reforms for which it was instituted.

While, however, it may be said, that I have been liberal in my *censure* of our public writers for neglecting this vital subject, let me not be accused of partiality.—From this general reprehension I am glad to find there is one exception, who has done the subject ample justice, though his modesty, which is always a proof of talent, has led him to conceal his name. I allude to the observations on the pillory, which appeared in the last number of the periodical work, entitled the *Pamphletter*. They appear to me so excellent, and the writer has discussed the subject in so masterly a manner, that I should like to see the whole of his remarks published in your *Register*. But as this may not be altogether consistent with your other arrangements, I have subjoined to this letter a short extract, to which I hope you will the more readily give insertion that its whole tendency is to enforce and illustrate the arguments of *Benevolus*, who so strenuously and so laudably contended against the existence of a mode of punishment possessing so many features of savage cruelty and barbarity.

Yours, &c. A. B.

"It may indeed be said, that some of the crimes thus visited are well deserving the utmost fury of an enraged people, and that there is no punishment denounced against them by our penal code at all equal to the darkness of their guilt. Be it so. That affords no reason why the defects of the law should

be made up by the assistance of popular tumult, or its necessities supplied by violence and outrage. In short, the pillory is in direct opposition to the principle upon which all laws are founded, and must serve, as far as its influence extends, to undermine the foundation of their authority. They were erected to control the unbridled passions of man, to take from individuals the power of revenge, to render punishments the determinate effect of firm and substantial enactments, instead of fluctuating with the rage and the sympathies of individuals, to prevent parties from being judges of their own injuries, to humanize society by taking from the strongest the power of inflicting arbitrary penalties by which it was reduced to a state of perpetual warfare, and to impress the mind with awe by the weight and the solemnity of their decisions. But this strange infliction actually reverses all these benign intentions which the collective wisdom of ages has gradually matured; it proceeds on antisocial principles, and tends to bring us back to our state of original barbarism. We have all been taught that the sacred throne of justice should be exalted far above the passions and the ever-fluctuating sympathies of man; that its voice should be as certain as it is awful, and its sentences untainted with any of the grosser particles that move in a lowlier atmosphere. We have learnt that while increasing wisdom should improve our laws, their actual dictates should be received during their existence with a noble and generous obedience. But here, in opposition to all these maxims, we see in them a principle which tends to their own destruction, a secret cancer which by insensible degrees is eating away the vital principle on which their vigor and their majesty depend. A judgment of the pillory is the worst of their enemies. If the mob applaud, they are set openly at defiance; and if on the other hand they break out into violence, the peace they should preserve is broken, the personal feelings they should subdue are excited, and the barbarous spirit of man unsoftened by civilization which they were formed to repress, is aroused by their powerful sanction. In the former case, the best emotions of the heart are injudiciously

arrayed against their authority; and a competition is excited where it is the noblest policy to conciliate. In the latter, the people act the part of unauthorized executioners, and become familiar with the most brutal of pleasures, the delight in pain, the horrible laugh of demoniac exultation at the sufferings of a fellow being. They who look on the tortures inflicted at a bull-baiting or a cock-fight with a virtuous horror, unless they measure out their disgust according to law, should feel a much stronger indignation at the sight of a fellow creature set up to be pelted almost to death amidst the drunken acclamation and infernal revelry of the lowest and most depraved of our species. And if thus pernicious in its immediate influence, it is not less dangerous in its example. Those whom you suffer to riot on the side of the laws may soon learn to oppose them with similar outrages. By allowing them thus to supply the deficiency of the lawgiver, we educate them for revolution and carnage. We give them arms to be awakened against our bosoms, whenever the breeze of discontent shall sweep over them. The hands that have learned to throw bricks and filth on the criminal, may exercise the same discipline on the judges, if they should be so unfortunate as to incur their displeasure.

It is sufficiently melancholy to see such a monument of savage life standing uninjured amidst the trophies of goodness and of virtue; but it is still more offensive to see it regarded as a pillar of our legislative system. It saddens us to see riots at all existing in a well regulated state; but we are doubly provoked by the strange anomaly which makes the laws appear to excite them. We regret to see a popular demagogue lead his followers to confusion and disorder; but our vexation has no bounds when a judge is compelled by the duties of his office to give up the reigns to the frenzy of the shameless and the degraded."

ŒDIPUS JUDAICUS.

The Ancients searched for Truth; the Moderns pretend they possess it.—*VOLNEY.*

MR. COBBETT.—When I sent you my two former letters, I endeavoured

to call your readers, not only to consider the situation of Mr. G. Houston, but also to request they would examine into the liberty of the press in this country; on whose altar that writer is now a victim; for until this "thinking nation" really understand his situation, and the motives for which he is punished, he will not be the last that will suffer in its cause.

I knew I touched a sore place, when I attempted to shew to your readers the discordant opinions entertained of that old book for which Eaton, Houston, and thousands more may be sent to prison. I knew that I might be a trinitarian, a unitarian, a Southcotearian, or any other *foolarian*; but that I must not bring the contradictions, and (what they call) the arguments of one tribe to combat the whims of the other, without exciting the suspicions of those who call themselves *Just!* But I have done to; and while I delight in the deed, I smile at their suspicions and contempt. Before I reply to your correspondent *Justus*, permit me to introduce the origin of my acquaintance with the work in question. You must know there is a town designated by one of the most corrupt of his time as "the toyshop of Europe; whose inhabitants, (I speak generally) in my estimation, rank lower for liberality of sentiment, general information, and Christian charity, than any other on the surface of the globe. The scale by which I estimate them is, that in and about the place, there are the remains of half-mutilated houses, because their inhabitants opposed the origin of our war with the French Republic, burnt by Church and King mobs; and that in those receptacles of resort, where its people *go to drink mild ale and talk wisdom*, there are scrolls inscribed with legible English characters "No Jacobins admitted here." I was leaving this town last Summer in the Mail, and in passing one of those houses whose miserable appearance appeals, in silent and pathetic language, to the frigid faculties, and would hush to silence their unmanly prejudices, if reflection ever animated their torpid brains; when I soon discovered from the observations of a gentleman in the coach, that he was the Father of the engraver of the plates, in the *OEdipus Judaicus*. He

explained to me the design and intention of its author; since which I have had a sight of the book. It has fully answered my expectation, and again I say displays a fund of prodigious erudition. The following short extract will shew its intention, and design, "I contend (preface page ii.) that the Ancient Jews, like other nations of antiquity, had their esoteric, and their exoteric doctrines; they concealed the former under innumerable types and symbols, the meaning of which is generally unknown among their descendants. It is the object of my book to explain the hidden sense of many passages in the Hebrew Scripture." Page 22, he says, "I recollect "that Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and I expect to "find traces of that wisdom in his works. "The learned among the ancient Egyptians were pure theists, as Cudworth "has proved. They were deeply skilled "in the sciences: but they carefully "concealed their mysteries under innumerable symbols and allegories. May "we not look then for the same thing "in the writings which are ascribed to "the Jewish Lawgiver. It is what I "have done, and I submit to the judgment of a few individuals, the result of my researches."

Of the 250 copies only, which I stated to have been printed, 100 now remain in the hands of the publisher. You will, therefore, judge whether I have been unfair in my former communication. As to quibbling about its method of publication and circulation, it would be a ridiculous waste of time. I wish a copy was in the hands of every person in the kingdom; for Sir Wm. Drummond would then make a better and more practical use of his abilities and learning. With regard to the cruel hint about a prosecution, for blasphemy, and the pillory, its author, like D. J. Eaton, will receive more praise, and of a better description, than if he were to be bespangled with orders and titles by every King in Christendom. O, Sir, it is cruel! You know it is, to talk of law in a country where it is possible a picked jury may be chosen by those who fatten on the wages of corruption, and who delight in persecuting such as attempt to undeceive the people. As to the writers, whose books I have faintly quoted, being Sir W. D. himself,

“ I guess no man in his senses will maintain so wild a position.”—Indeed, from the wording of your Correspondent’s letter, I do not believe he is serious in his assertion. But I challenge him to the proof; for Candidus, one of the three, tells Sir Wm. Drummond that he prefers the old version best, and censures him for ridiculing the Bible. Suppose, however, I am wrong in my opinion of the author of the *Oedipus Judaicus*; suppose he is the *story teller*, the *fool*, and the *vain jackdaw*, they wish to represent him, what “ necessity” was there for this great and mighty parson, the Christian Advocate, to notice his production? Why did he make such endeavours to obtain a copy, he best knows how? Surely, the “ pious, thinking people of this country,” could not have their “ minds tainted” by an octavo book of not quite 500 pages, “ of the most hollow and fallacious description.” But these are the rules the hypocrites act upon. I was a boy when Thomas Paine’s works were published; but I recollect the writer was at first held too contemptible for notice, and the “ friends to social order, “ and our holy religion,” were told they had nothing to fear. After a while, the AttorneyGeneral interfered, who got a jury to condemn Paine’s books, and then the canting junto asserted they were answered and refuted. “ Read our side, (said they,) “ see what Bishop Watson says.” So says *Justus*; he calls the author of the *Oedipus Judaicus* a vain jackdaw; tells the people to read the book; (which he knows cannot be had), exhorts them to attend to the Christian Advocate, and censures those who take part against him. Come, come, *Justus*, give up your prejudices. Let the “ Sicilian Knight and British Privy Councillor,” interpret the Bible his own way. You may depend on it I will let the Archbishop’s Chaplain, (who appears blessed with all those amiable qualities that adorned his predecessor in the ever memorable time of William Penn) put what interpretation on it he pleases. Every one that reads the bible may undoubtedly find both instruction and delight; but he will be more likely to become a rational being, if he be allowed to put his own construction upon it, and interpret it his own way. I should like to know by

what principle of rule or right any one dares to interfere and prescribe the method by which another is to exercise his judgment. That a deal of mischief has been the result of this interference, no one, acquainted with the history of his own country, much more with the history of the world, can deny; and whether the same quantum of mischief would have taken place provided the bible had never been known, is, in my opinion, difficult to prove. At any rate, the system of priesthood has had a sufficient trial; and it would be more becoming in those who profess such anxiety for the circulation of the bible, to let it take its chance. Let them, at any rate, shew their disinterestedness, by giving up the *pounds, shillings, and pence* it produces; or take pay only in that manner, and in those quantities, which those who receive their assistance can agree and afford to give. If they should find that they do not thrive so well under this system, I hope they will recollect, there will be more manliness in their adopting the following maxim, than in returning to the old practice:

Some other scheme must occupy their brain;
For those who once have eat must eat again.

VARRO.

ON RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.

LETTER V. -

“ Advise, but force not.”

ST. BERNARD’S LETTERS.

SIR.—Marmontel, in his *Bellisarius*, [the fifteenth chapter of which, I would particularly recommend to the perusal of every person who has not read it] says, “ Truth cannot fail to triumph, but “ it must not be by the arm of flesh. “ By putting the sword of VENGEANCE “ into the hand of TRUTH, you entrust “ ERROR with it also. The very possession of that sword, will always be “ deemed a sufficient authority to wield “ it without mercy, and PERSECUTION “ will always be on the side of the “ strongest.”

How simple, and yet how forcible is the mode of reasoning adopted by this beautiful writer. If kings were supposed to be God’s vicegerents upon earth, and, in that capacity were allowed to

commit whatever enormities they pleased, in defence of what they considered, or were told by their priests was the truth, is it not evident, from the diversity of sentiments of different sovereigns, and the opposite persuasions of their various teachers, that they must necessarily, at one time, and in one country, be punishing their subjects for entertaining opinions which, at another time, and in another country, were deemed perfectly orthodox. Does not this prove incontestably, that by once admitting the principle, that the magistrate is to defend Truth, he will much oftener be found defending ERROR? Every one will easily agree, that all systems cannot be right. "Error," says the same author, "has an immensity of space, and Truth is like a mathematical point in the prodigious void." Now, although every one claims that point to himself, is it not palpable, as Truth is one, and Error multifarious, that the greater portion of religious murders, barbarities, robberies, and incarceration, must have been in defence of Error rather than of Truth. How modest, how humble, ought such considerations to make us? How cautious ought these reflections to render us, of arrogating to ourselves the *sole possession* of the truth, when we find that thousands who think different from us, claim the same happiness? Ought it not to make us diffident of ourselves, and forbearing towards others? Those who have studied human nature, will have perceived that this violent animosity and furious persecuting zeal, does not arise so much from a generous love of virtue, or an enthusiastic admiration of abstract truth, as from the inordinate thirst for *power* which pervades the heart of every human being. We wish others to think as we do, and the greater part of us would if we had the power, *compel* them to do it. The sword of religious persecution is an instrument upon which every party has played its tune, when raised to power. The celebrated Dr. Franklin remarks, that if we look into history, for "the character of the ancient Christians, "we shall find few who have not in their turn been persecutors, and complainers "of persecution. The primitive Christians thought persecution extremely "wrong in the pagans, but practised it "on one another." I could easily give credit to this assertion, even if I had

not examined history for myself; for being of a curious and speculative turn, I have made myself acquainted with most denominations of Christians at present existing in the Christian world; and after having carefully examined their tenets, studied their prejudices, and observed their conduct, I do affirm, that however tame and tolerant they may be, while *low* in the world, they all possess the latent seeds of persecution. These only want fostering, by the genial warmth of power, to shoot forth with an enthusiastic fury, compounded of envy, ambition, pride, hatred, and fanatic zeal; as if it were commissioned by heaven. I would except the Quakers from the charge of being likely to evince a persecuting spirit towards other sects, though they are capable of doing it as to their own people;* but the Friends of the *present* day are not a religious society, like the Weslian or Whitfieldian Methodists. They are an *Aristocratical* civil community; a trading company, and a set of respectable, industrious, economical, money-getting disciplinarians; who possess no more practical religion than the members of the Church of England.

But to return to the sentiment of Franklin, respecting the early Christians. It was shewn in my last, that they were persecuted by the Romans, at the instigation of their priests, in the same manner as the Deists are molested by us, at the instance of our priests, on account of the simplicity of their tenets. I cannot illustrate the subject better, than by quoting *Justin Martyr*, one of the earliest and most learned writers of the Eastern Church, born of heathen parents, educated a pagan, and who was a platonick philosopher, previous to his becoming a Christian. He resided at Rome, during the reign of *Antonius Pius*; and upon a persecution breaking out against the Christians, he presented an *Apology* in their behalf, pointing out in a very able manner, the impropriety and absurdity of religious persecution; which *Apology* caused the Emperor to send a letter to the States of Asia, not only forbidding the Christians to be persecuted, but enjoining, "that if any one hereafter shall "go on to inform against this sort of

* See the case of Thomas Foster, disowned by Ratcliff Monthly Meeting, for being suspected of believing in *only One God*.

“men, purely because they are Christians, let the persons accused be discharged, although they be found to be Christians, and let the informer himself undergo the punishment.” When shall we see an *Antonius*? Yet the Apology which produced this, contains passages which no one would, in this enlightened, humane, and liberal age, dare to advance. In the second section, of his second Apology, he says, “Reason informs and admonishes us, that true philosophers and men of virtue, who have been filled with godliness and holiness, have loved and honoured the simple truth, and have turned aside from following the ancients, whenever their opinions have been found erroneous, or bad. Both scripture and sound reason enjoin us, not only to avoid those whose lives have been wicked; who by teaching, argument, or other means, have disseminated false and impious doctrines; not to imitate, nor in any respect to be led by them; but also prescribe, that the inquisitive lover of truth should prefer it to his life, and should not be deterred by the fear of death, or threats of torture, from speaking and acting according to justice.”

These noble sentiments may be used by every reformer; they were appropriate to those who suffered in Smithfield, to Galileo, Huss, and Jerome of Prague; they may be used with equal propriety by the Deists of the present day, and by all persons persecuted for what they believe to be true. Those of my Friends who will take the trouble, will find much learning, philosophy, and curious matter in the works of this Father. I am writing a treatise upon the model of the Apologies of *Justin Martyr* and *Tertullian*, to be entitled, (if God spare my life, and that of the best of Princes, till he shall ascend the throne of these realms) “An Apology to King George the Fourth, in behalf of that most learned and respectable portion of his subjects, the Materialists, Sceptics, and Deists; by a CHRISTIAN;” and intend approaching him in person with a *holy* boldness, to deliver a copy thereof. Every thing which has been done towards liberalising mankind in this country, will be found the isolated efforts of individuals; but in

France some of the greatest geniuses the world has produced, were united hand in hand for fifty years, for the purpose of enlightening their fellow creatures. It is a great pity the enemies of superstition, tyranny, and priesthood are not better known to each other; and more organized in their exertions. Look at the *Fanatics* of every description; how they unite, and how successful they are in stultifying the human understanding, that most glorious ornament with which NATURE has vouchsafed to embellish man? Would not a general medium of communication for Theology, Metaphysics, and Moral Philosophy, to be open with impartiality to the Churchman, the Dissenter, the Disciple of NATURE, the followers of Pyrrho, and every class of Latitudinarian, be the means of facilitating such an object? It would lead people to think, examine, and judge for themselves; and ultimately inculcate a liberality of sentiment, which can only be acquired by the exercise of our reason concerning the nature of man, his intellectual faculties, and education. It would enable them to make that generous allowance for the opinions and prejudices of others, so essentially necessary to the harmony of society; but which they can never possess, while their reading and observation are confined within the pale of a particular sect; and while they are in the habit of implicitly receiving their religious notions, upon the credit of others, without investigation. A Journal of the above description has long been a *desideratum* in the republic of letters; for notwithstanding the number and variety of theological and controversial magazines, there are none *completely open to all parties*; whatever liberality they may profess. Some are exclusively the vehicles of one set of opinions only, and refuse insertion to every thing of an opposite tendency. Others admit nothing contrary to their own tenets, but what they think can easily be answered by some of their own partizans. I have taken the liberty of throwing out these few hints, as to the nature of a Journal much wanted by the Friends of Free Discussion; and remain, dear Sir, your's truly,

ERASMIUS PERKINS.
London, Jan. 18, 1815.